DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 095 SO 001 420

TITLE	Social Science Research Council Items. Volume 25, Number 2.
INSTITUTION	Social Science Research Council, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jun 71
NOTE	12p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10017
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies, *Demography, Fellowships, Grants, Migration, *National Demography, *Newsletters, *Population Trends, Social Change, *Social Sciences
IDENTIFIERS	United States

ABSTRACT

Along with a substantive article on a selected topic within the social sciences, this quarterly newsletter customarily carries news of committee activities, fellowships and grants awarded, and announcements of recent publications. The article in this issue is "People of the United States in the Twentieth Century: Continuity, Diversity, and Change". It comprises sections of the concluding chapter of "People of the United States in the Twentieth Century," one in a series of monographs planned by a former Council committee, and the Bureau of the Census. The article provides an historical sketch of demographic factors in the United States, such as fertility, morality, migration, and nativity, and their relationship to a changing cultural context. Though the newsletter is intended primarily as a house organ, those interested in receiving it should request that their name be placed on the mailing list. (JLB)

ED052095
SP 001 420

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ITEMS

VOLUME 25 · NUMBER 2 · JUNE 1971
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017

PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: CONTINUITY, DIVERSITY, AND CHANGE*

by Irene B. Taeuber and Conrad Taeuber

THERE has been continuity in culture and in the reproductive institutions of marriage and family from the earliest English settlement along the Atlantic seaboard to the present. Fertility and mortality have been interrelated, but not in a tragic setting of death rates so high that survival was precarious or in the converse and potentially tragic setting of birth rates so high that the pressures of increasing numbers on finite subsistence threatened famine, epidemic, and conflict. Man's relations to resources were always relatively favorable. Increasingly educated and skilled people in an era of increasing contact and communication yielded economic growth and social development. The people who were European in origin brought the culture of Europe with them, and they remained in contact and interaction with its advancing science, technology, social movements, and political ideals. Insofar as there was a lesser development, it was that of a people on an isolated perimeter of the main cultural area, not that of an unlettered people moving toward modernization within indigenous cultural, religious, and linguistic contexts.

DEMOGRAPHIC TRANSITION

There were several demographic transitions in the increase and expansion of population on this sparsely occupied continent. In the earliest centuries, adaptations involved early and more nearly universal marriage along with relatively uninhibited childbearing among the married. There were neither doctors nor hospitals in abundance; the germ theory of disease along with vaccination, innoculation, and antibiotics were all discoveries to be made in future times. Birth rates were high enough, death rates low enough, that natural increase alone thrust populations upward at 30 percent a decade until well into the nineteenth century.

The longest of the transitions, that of declining fertility, declining mortality, and slowing natural increase, was already in process when the first census was taken in 1790. It continued along with the agricultural expansion, the industrialization, the urbanization, and the immigrant absorptions of the nineteenth century. It reached its lowest point in the great depression of the 1930's with the childbearing of the birth cohorts of 1900–1904 and 1905–1909. In the early national period, fertility had been so high that Malthus found here his

* This report comprises sections of the concluding chapter of *People of the United States in the Twentieth Century*, the fifth monograph in the series planned by the Council's former Committee on Population Census Monographs (1958–68) in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census. This monograph, which was scheduled for publication by the U.S. Government Printing Office in December 1970, is expected to be ready for distribution in June. The four monographs already issued, and available from the same publisher, are *Income Distribution in the United States*, by Herman P. Miller; *Education of the American Population*, by John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam; *People of Rural America*, by Dale E. Hathaway, J. Allan Beegle, and W. Keith Bryant; and *Changing Characteristics of the Negro Population*, by Daniel O. Price. Dudley Kirk, Stanford University, was chairman of the Committee on Population Census Monographs throughout its existence. The other members included the late Robert W. Burgess, Director of the Bureau of the Census, 1953–61; John D. Durand, University of Pennsylvania; Ronald Freedman, University of Michigan; Daniel O. Price, University of Texas at Austin; John W. Riley, Jr., Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States; and George J. Stolnitz, Indiana University. Paul Webbink, former Vice-President of the Council, and Conrad Taeuber, Associate Director for Demographic Fields, Bureau of the Census, met regularly with the committee. In addition to the Bureau of the Census, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States and the Russell Sage Foundation provided support for the census monograph program.

classic illustration of man's potentialities to reproduce under favorable circumstances. However, a century and a half later, fertility was insufficient for the permanent replacement of the population.

The experience of the past and the theories of population sustained the inference that the population dynamics of the modernized, industrialized, and urbanized society would be continuing decline in rates of reproduction. Eventually there would be decreasing numbers and the retrogressive changes induced by shrinking age cohorts and aging populations. Instead, the speedier economic transformations, the accelerated urbanization, the technological revolutions in transportation and communication, the onward rush into higher education and professional occupations, and a dispersing affluence unparalleled in history were accompanied by declining ages at marriage and increasing rates of childbearing that soon raised fertility to the levels of the early twentieth century.

The characteristics, dynamics, and interrelations of marriage, family, and fertility have been the major focus in this study, along with the migrations and mobilities of the metropolitan society. They need not be summarized here. Rather, some of the puzzling aspects and the unanswered questions as to the future should be noted. The downward movement in age at marriage, as the earlier and more abundant childbearing, came along with an increasing participation of women in the labor force. The mechanization and automation of home facilities and services that might have been expected to free women from the home instead made feasible the combined roles of family, child rearing, and economic activity. Altered roles for men, as for women, accompanied the new ways of living in the outer sectors of metropolitan areas. The women who were educated and affluent were quite cognizant of the means of fertility limitation, and most of them practiced contraception. Expectations and plans centered around families of two to four children. Some of the women had fewer children than they had expected or desired, while others had more. Overall, though, reproductive performance was in accord with the desires of the women and the families.

There were major nonaffluent groups in the population. Here educational levels were low, skills inadequate, and poverty pervasive. Some were native whites of ancient lineage, but disproportionate numbers were members of minority groups, whether of color or of subculture. There were expressed desires for smaller families but insufficient motivations to achieve them. However, all groups participated in the transition to lower fertility and then in the upward movements so abundantly documented in the census data of 1950 and 1960 on numbers of children ever born.

As the anticipations of publicists and the projections of demographers assumed continuities in the higher levels of fertility, concerns shifted from a future of declining numbers of people to a future where the means for living and the quality of life would be jeopardized by increasing numbers. In the meantime, birth rates again turned downward. The highest birth rate was that of 1957. Thereafter there was decline for whites and for nonwhites in all regions of the country. The present significance and the future relevance were both difficult to determine.

Is there a new demographic transition? Was the upturn in births in recent decades a temporary deviation in the transition to low fertility and mortality? Or are irregular fluctuations or cyclical changes in growth characteristics of reproduction in a modern population?

MIGRATION AND METROPOLIS

Migration was a major process in the formation, distribution, and transformation of the American population. Many continuities underlay the changing types, directions, and speeds of movement in the Atlantic crossing, the expansion across the continent, and urbanization. Migration was part of the life cycle. There was dependence and preparation in childhood and youth. Migration was concentrated in the early adult years. After the single migration or the mobile years, there was again relative stability, perhaps with local mobilities but only occasionally the great migration. The international migrants included high proportions of the young, as did the westward-moving pioneers, whether to farms, towns, or cities. The migrants from rural to urban areas included disproportionate numbers of young adults.

The migrations of youth and the mobilities within areas of residence increased intermarriages among those of differing origins. The processes of acculturation, if not assimilation, were speeded. Most of the children of immigrants were born and reared in great cities. School attendance was compulsory, and instruction was in English. The children of the internal migrants to cities received more adequate and longer schooling than that which had been available to their parents in rural areas and small towns. There were compensatory forces in many of the migrations, however. Those who moved westward often left the amenities and the institutions of the older areas behind them. The education of the children of many pioneers may have been less adequate and briefer than that of the parents. But in the expansion areas the growth of towns and cities proceeded along with or soon followed the occupation of the land. Rural to urban movements occurred in areas still close to the frontier conditions of living and working. Schools in-

creased as the local initiatives were supplemented by state developments, and land grants subsidized the formation of colleges and universities.

These diverse movements created a population whose national origins spanned the continent of Europe from West to East, from North to South. The migrations within the country dispersed the native white population across the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with increasing mergings of those from different areas within the country. The urbanward currents contributed further to the intermingling of the natives and speeded the merging of those whose immigrant origins lay varying numbers of years and generations in the past.

The participation of those of diverse origins in the agricultural expansion, the industrialization, and the urbanization were largely processes of the white group. Africans brought as slaves had the stabilities of that status for themselves and their children. There were local mobilities and there were movements as chattels. The patterns, the demographic consequences, and the social and economic correlates of migration differed greatly for the free and the slave, the white and the black. Southern concentrations of blacks and the social and economic status accorded them long preserved these differences. Most of the surviving Indians remained outside the developing economy and society of those who now occupied lands that had been Indian. For many, the stabilities of the reservations replaced the cyclical and the seasonal movements of the past. There were also areas of stability and isolation in rural America. There were failures and returns in the international and the continental movements. Overall, though, the movements of people created, patterned, and preserved the ways of living that became distinctive of the new world. Migration was essential process in, if not key to, the integration of all regional, subregional, color, and cultural groups into the interrelated national population.

In the century and more of record prior to 1900, urban populations increased more rapidly than rural populations. Migrations to towns and cities occurred alongside the agricultural expansion across the continent.

In 1900, two fifths of the population of the Conterminous United States was in the areas that were Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in 1960. This fraction increased to half in 1920 and to three fifths in 1950. In 1960, some 63 percent of the total population lived in SMSA's. Increase had been almost one third from 1900 to 1910. It was more than one fifth each decade thereafter except that of the great depression. The population outside SMSA's increased 13 percent from 1900 to 1910 but it did not increase as much as 9 percent in any later decade.

Most of the international migrants and substantial proportions of the internal migrants from nonmetropolitan areas went to SMSA's. If the years from 1900 to 1960 are viewed as a whole, the SMSA's absorbed 78.6 percent of the national increase of 102.5 million, while the areas outside SMSA's absorbed 21.4 percent. The total population of 1960 was 2.4 times that of 1900. The ratios were 3.5 for the populations of SMSA's and 1.5 for the populations outside them.

The transitions from the migrations and mobilities of the expanding agricultural economy and the predominantly rural society to those of the industrial economy and the metropolitan society were processes of coexistence over time, with a gradual increase in the primacy of the metropolitan migrations and the intra- and intermetropolitan mobilities. The accelerating mobilities were those within SMSA's, particularly those of whites from central cities to outer areas. Movements for residence and commuting for labor extended the metropolis beyond the boundaries of the SMSA's. Interchange migrations and the migrations that yielded population redistributions characterized metropolitan populations. The historic migrations from nonmetropolitan to metropolitan areas continued, but high rates of movement from areas of out-migration yielded lesser and lesser rates of migrant growth in the areas of in-migration. In migration, as in fertility, the decades after the mid-century are ones of transition to new patterns that involve modification if not reversals of the traditional patterns.

There are fundamental questions regarding the future of migration, mobility, and metropolis. Is continuity in concentration in metropolitan areas the probable future? Or will there be more dispersed patterns of living and of production? In recent decades, there have been coastward and westward movements of population, with slow increase or even decline in the mid-continent. The prime destinations of the moving Americans have been Florida, California, and the Southwest. Will these trends continue? Will Pacific concentrations become similar in magnitudes to the Atlantic concentrations? Or will the movements to California and the Pacific Coast be only the filling of the last frontier, albeit one that was advanced technological and metropolitan rather than agricultural and rural?

There are other intractable queries as to the future of migration, stability, and mobility. Will the migrations of the blacks from the South to other regions continue? If so, will they be accelerated or slowed? Will social and economic changes and a declining fertility of blacks within the South lessen the motivations for exodus and the size of the cohorts available for it? What is the future of residential segregation in metropolitan

areas, with the lesser educated and the poorer blacks and other minority groups concentrated in inner cities?

Perhaps the most critical of the questions of mobility is that of the future of the fertility of the populations now in metropolitan areas, whether in inner cities or in the more affluent outer areas. The future of migration and mobility cannot be assessed apart from the interrelations of social and economic change and reproduction within the metropolis.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, OCCUPATIONS AND EDUCATION

The relations between science, technology, and population dynamics are complex. The presence of intermediate variables, the prevalent discrepancies between that which could be achieved and that which is, and the lags between science and human adaptation are not denials of the fundamental role of science, technology, production, and productivity in the demographic transformations of the last three-quarters of a century. The argument could be pursued along many paths. Low death rates and relatively low birth rates are essential bases for, and correlates of, modern economies and societies. The role of science and technology in the increasing survival of those who are born has been major; the role in reproduction is increasing with scientific advances both in the reduction of sterility and in the regulation or limitation of fertility. The transportation of the clipper ship, the canal, the covered wagon, and the mule team were essential to economic development and continental expansion in earlier periods. The steamship and the railroad advanced economic integration and human dispersion. The automobile, the transportation network, and the airplanes are developments of more recent decades. Advanced communication techniques are almost revolutionary in their implications for social interaction, social change, and demographic response.

The changes in ways and places of living in the past were related to an industrialization that required unskilled and semiskilled laborers. Automation altered the types and the locus of manpower needs. The electronic transformation now in process will alter requirements and stimulate changes in the capabilities, the motivations, and the life paths of individuals. Conversely, the advances in science and technology and the changes in production, distribution, and ways of living are products of the scientific and technical manpower and the advancing capabilities of the people.

The aspects that we have considered throughout this study of the changing people of the United States in the twentieth century are the occupational structure of the labor force and the educational level of the adult population. The changes over the decades from 1900 to 1960 need only be noted here.

In 1900, farm workers were more than two fifths of the male labor force, but less than one tenth of it in 1960. Professional, technical, and related workers increased from 3.4 percent in 1900 to 10.4 percent in 1960. Aside from the depression years from 1930 to 1940, the rate of change tended to increase from decade to decade. Manual and service workers were increasing in absolute numbers and as percentages of the total male labor force, but there were major internal changes within the broad categories: numbers of craftsmen, foremen, and operatives were increasing, while numbers of laborers were declining. Numbers of private household workers were decreasing; numbers of other service workers were increasing. In 1900, farm workers and nonfarm laborers combined were 56.4 percent of the male labor force; in 1960, 16.3 percent. In 1900, professional and technical workers along with managers and officials were 10.2 percent of the male labor force; in 1960, 21.2 percent.

The changing capabilities and roles of women and the changing nature of economy and society were apparent in the occupations of the women who were in the labor force. The percentage of women in white-collar occupations was 17.8 in 1900 and 56.3 in 1960. In 1900, almost half of all women working were in private household service or in agriculture; in 1960, only one tenth. The greatest single increase occurred in the clerical occupations. The percentage of occupied women in this type of activity was 4.0 in 1900 and 30.9 in 1960.

The educational advances underlay and were stimulated by the occupational changes. These in turn were stimulants to and products of economic developments and scientific and technological revolutions. In 1900, one fourth of the men aged 25 to 29 or older had attended school less than 5 years, if at all. Three fifths had attended school 5 to 8 years. Less than 6 percent had attended college; less than 3 percent were college graduates. In 1960, the modal educational level of the men aged 25 to 29 was high school graduation. Almost one third were high school graduates without further schooling. Another 12.9 percent had attended college but had not graduated, while 14.5 percent had completed 4 years or more of college. Altogether, three fifths of the men aged 25 to 29 had completed high school.

These were the educational levels of men aged 25 to 29 in 1960. Differences between whites and nonwhites remained major. The percentage with an eighth grade education or less was 17.6 for whites but 36.7 for nonwhites. The percentage with a high school education or more was 62.6 for whites but 35.4 for nonwhites. For

whites and nonwhites alike, educational levels for those aged 25 to 29 yield an overly optimistic picture of capabilities and skills. In a chronologically backward movement through older and older age cohorts, the successively higher age groups include larger and larger proportions of the less educated, smaller and smaller proportions of the high school and college graduates. And in each successively older group, the relative disadvantages of the nonwhites increase.

The relations of occupation and education to present and prospective population status and dynamics are multidirectional. The relations in the timings of economic, social, and demographic change are basic. The European immigrants of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries were largely unskilled and poorly educated, but their physical capabilities were essential to employment and contributed to industrialization. The coincidence has been less close in many of the internal migrations. The youth released for metropolitan movement with the mechanization of agriculture in the mid-continent were less disadvantaged in urban settings than the youth released with the mechanization of cotton production in the South. Whatever the role of the social and the psychological factors as contrasted with the economic factors, the black exodus of the last quarter-century thrust the poorly educated, the unskilled, and the socially unprepared into the metropolitan milieu. It did so at a time when labor demands were growing for the professional, the technical, and the skilled, but declining for the poorly trained, the unskilled, and those not adapted to the amenities and the discipline of urban living and wage labor.

The continuing automation of production and distribution and the electronic developments now in process introduce major uncertainties into the projection of the future for other groups as well as for the unskilled. Many of the critical demographic questions concern the future patterns and types of the labor force participation of women. The earlier marriages and the higher fertility in the years after 1940 were associated with relative retardation in the educational advances of women as contrasted with men. The rapid increases in the occupations of men were in the professional, technical, and related fields, while the rapid advances in the occupations of women were in the clerical field. The questions of the future economic activities of women involve both the changing roles of women and the changing labor needs of the economy. The future of marriage, family, and fertility will be related to the educational achievements of women and to their economic activities after marriage. The reverse statement has equal plausibility. Altered aspirations and anticipations may stimulate educational achievements and different involvements and sequences in economic activities after marriage.

NATIVITY, COLOR, AND CULTURE

There were widening diversities in the dynamics of the populations of areas and among groups in the long transition of industrialization and urbanization. In the twentieth century, differences in fertility and in mortality narrowed, while increasing proportions of the people participated in, or were influenced by, the migrations to metropolitan areas and the life within them. In the earlier decades the peoples across the residential continuum from rural farms to great cities were moving from different bases and at variable speeds toward a modern life of lower fertility and lower mortality. It was assumed widely that position on the continuum of status was temporary. Integration into the modern ways of living and assimilation to the values, the behavior codes, the motivations, and the achievement potentials of the national society were ongoing and natural processes.

The analysis of the changing population over the years and the decades long sustained theories of universally operative and convergent processes. The millions of immigrants of differing origins adjusted here in similar ways. Most members of the first generation born in this country adopted the English language, became upwardly mobile in economic activity, and were more restrictive in reproduction than the native Americans among whom they lived. Fertility declined in urban and in rural areas. The hazards of living and the rates of dying became increasingly similar in city and in country. Internal and international migrants and their descendants mingled in the metropolitan areas. Color did not preclude transition, for the Chinese and the Japanese were in the vanguard of modernization. Some of the indigenous Indians were dispersed across the country. Fertility and mortality were declining among the black people of the South. And, in early phases, urbanization in the North was accompanied by reduced fertility.

In the decades from 1890 or 1900 to 1940, there were convergences in the declining fertility of women in the regions, subregions, and lesser areas, as among most social, economic, nativity, color, and subcultural groups. The major persistent diversities were those associated with isolation, deprivation, cultural separateness, and color barriers, or some combination of these factors. In the decades after 1940, increasing fertility was also convergent in area and in group populations.

Fertility that was high in absolute definition or relative to that of the modal population of the time characterized those who were not full participants in eco-

nomic and social advance, whether in rural areas or metropolitan centers. In the demographic history of the country, the social and economic mobilities and the assimilations of once disadvantaged minority and area populations were associated with migrations from areas of origin to urbanizing or metropolitan areas, particularly those at a distance. Declines in the fertility of populations still in Appalachian counties are associated directly or indirectly with the out-migrations from the counties. The changing fertility of those once Appalachian and their descendants is largely a metropolitan process. Fertility is still high among the Indians on reservations in the West, as among the Aleuts, Eskimos, and Indians of Alaska. In 1940, the fertility of Puerto Ricans was pervasively high. In 1960, the diversities within the rural barrios of Puerto Rico were related to development and to contact. The major differentiations were those between nonmetropolitan and metropolitan populations within Puerto Rico and between the metropolitan populations in Puerto Rico and in the mainland. Similar relations between location, migration, and metropolitan residence characterized the populations of Spanish surname in the Southwest. In 1960, fertility varied roughly in relation to physical remoteness from the rural-farm areas of Texas and the generations of distance from Mexican ancestry. Among Puerto Ricans and Spanish Americans, those who achieved higher education and more advanced social and economic status manifested the fertility appropriate to that educational level and that status.

The processes of demographic assimilation through migration and transition across the generations were not inherent consequences of migration but products of the aspirations and motivations that stimulated movement and the social and economic mobilities that followed it. Hence, the associations of migrations and fertility when migrations are largely intra- or intermetropolitan may differ from those when migration was largely a rural-to-urban movement. The associations of the internal movements of native peoples with the later course of reproduction may differ from those of the international migrants of earlier periods. Theoretically, color and subculture are separable dimensions of demographic transitions. Factually, they are aspects of historic evolutions, heritages of the past to the present, and components in the economic, social, and political changes that are forming the demographic patterns of the future. The explanations of the present associations of fertility, color, subculture, and poverty are not found in the demographic histories of the European immigrants of past periods, though these are relevant. The assessment of associations in the future cannot be based on projections of past trends from a largely rural past to a mainly metropolitan present and future.

The differentials within and between the color and cultural groups are wide. They are associated with social status, economic levels, access to paths of social and economic mobility, and the fixity or fluidity of the barriers to communication and participation.

The developments of the future will determine whether there is persistence, widening, or convergence in the demographic differences now associated with nativity, color, culture, and poverty. The essential projection is not the demographic component but the direction and speed of the changes in the ascribed status based on color, subculture, or other group diversity. The rates of economic advance and the movements to equality in education and in access to social amenities and residential freedoms are closely related processes. The most unpredictable of the impacts on marriage, family, and reproduction is the transition from acquiescence to increasingly firm and often rebellious protest. Here the uncertainties as to the population dynamics of minority groups in future years merge into those that surround the assessments of the future in the general population. The questionings of the established order, the codes of conduct of the middle classes, the ethics of inequalities, and the duties of conformity extend far beyond the youth who are members of disadvantaged minorities.

The outlines of the demographic future require integrated rather than separated analyses of the social and economic structures and changes, the distributions of incomes and opportunities, and the migrations to metropolitan areas and the mobilities within them. There are more basic processes, difficult in the definition, intangible in the operation, and intractable to measurement in demographic context. Ours has been an assimilative society, with geographic migrations and social and economic mobilities contributing to, if not creating, a plural society rather than a fragmented population. Convergences in fertility are rough measures of that process. The critical questions in the continuation of the process and hence in the future of the national population are no longer the straightforward ones of the integrations of the populations of regions and subregions, of rural areas and cities, into a unified whole. They are the questions of changes within regions and subregions, within rural areas and cities, inside and outside metropolitan areas. The demographic processes of differentiation and convergence associated with color, culture, economic inequality, and social tension are central in the future of a population that is largely metropolitan and increasingly remote from its agricultural bases.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

SOCIAL SCIENCE IN ITALY

(Joint with Adriano Olivetti Foundation)

Manlio Rossi-Doria (chairman), Joseph LaPalombara (liaison), Francesco Alberoni, Norberto Bobbio, Massimo Fichera, Pendleton Herring, Franco Modigliani, Wilbert E. Moore; *Secretary,* Alberto Spreafico

The committee is scheduled to meet on May 27–29, when guidelines for its activities through December 1972 are to be discussed. Since the preceding meeting in April 1970 Messrs. LaPalombara, Modigliani, and Moore have visited Italy in connection with various aspects of the committee's ongoing programs, particularly with regard to developments and problems pertaining to the training institutes at Ancona (economics), Turin (political science), Milan (sociology), and Naples (interdisciplinary). In addition, the American contingent and the President of the Social Science Research Council have participated in discussions which have resulted in an agreement with the National Research Council of Italy whereby continuing basic financing of the training institutes can be provided from the public funds that it administers.

Under this agreement, the SSRC will make available to the institutes at Ancona, Milan, and Naples approximately $43,000 per year. The Adriano Olivetti Foundation will provide equipment, clerical and administrative personnel, and some related administrative services. The CNR in turn will make available the annual sum of approximately $165,000, to be used for training and research training fellowships. Although the agreement was initially expected to be for a three-year period, administrative regulations on the Italian side necessitated a one-year contract, with the formal understanding that the arrangement is renewable for three years. The committee hopes that this agreement may become the basis for a similar one directed to support of the political science institute at Turin. Because support for this discipline is managed by a different subcommittee of the CNR, the Turin institute was not included in the first agreement.

During the year the committee's effort to establish a postgraduate training institute at Naples entered a second phase. Following a first year during which attention was focused primarily on specialized seminars for future tutors and on devising a curriculum, systematic training was provided for approximately 10 fellows. One striking aspect of the Naples program is that it has attracted financial support not only from the CNR, but from FORMEZ, a public agency charged with the development of leadership in the Italian South, and from the Ministry of Public Instruction. Also noteworthy is the high quality of the five tutors currently assigned to the institute.

The plans for an institute at Naples, however, continue to present the committee with perplexing difficulties. The Italian scholar initially recruited to direct the institute has not been able to arrange a transfer to Naples. Because no replacement has yet been found, the program there is currently being supervised by a committee consisting of several representatives of the joint committee and a few Italian scholars. Interim guidance for the program has been offered by Mr. Moore and by Gino Germani, but local direction by a senior Italian scholar remains the most pressing need and a necessary condition for an ambitious graduate training program that will focus conceptually on the social problems of development.

The committee's Secretariat has proceeded to implement the decision to expand the services it makes available to visiting foreign scholars. It has recruited an additional staff member to deal with a wide range of activities to facilitate research in Italy by United States and other foreign scholars, and has secured from the Interuniversity Council for European Studies funds to help defray the rapidly increasing costs of providing such services.

With funds provided by the committee it was also possible to devise a system whereby English-language books, monographs, and periodicals needed by the libraries available to students at Milan and Naples could be ordered centrally in the United States and shipped in bulk to each of the two institutes. In implementing this system, the assistance of the acquisitions department of the Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, was invaluable. The flow of books to the institutes has begun, and each institute is expected to have strong basic research libraries of several thousand volumes by the fall of 1971.

An important problem to which the committee is devoting attention is that of stimulating a continuous flow of foreign scholars to the faculties of the training institutes. Although there are a number of organizational arrangements through which affiliations with the institutes might be facilitated, the problem seems to hinge primarily on the amount of lead time American scholars must have before a definite arrangement can be made and on the amount of time they may be willing to contribute to teaching.

The problem of ensuring a desirable flow of visiting faculty is related to another question high on the committee's agenda, namely, whether, how, and to what purposes its activities might be integrated in broader programs to internationalize teaching and research in the social sciences. Initial conversations between American and Italian committee members and other scholars have suggested the possible utility of some committee effort in this direction.

During the spring of 1971, because of competing professional responsibilities and commitments, the time that the Secretary of the committee could devote to its activities has had to be reduced. Because the success of its efforts has depended in such great part on his invaluable contributions, it is hoped that he will continue in his present capacity at least through 1972.

J. LaP.

TRANSNATIONAL SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Morton Deutsch (chairman), Donald T. Campbell, Leon Festinger, Martin Irle, Jaromír Janoušek, Harold H. Kelley, Serge Moscovici, Luis I. Ramallo, Henri Tajfel; *staff*, Stanley Lehmann

The committee met with the independent Latin American Committee for Social Psychology (pro tem)—of which Mr. Ramallo is chairman—in Mexico City on December 28–29, 1970 to develop plans for a program to enable about 10 Latin American students to obtain the Ph.D. degree in social psychology through a combination of training in Latin American and foreign settings. The meeting was partially supported by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies. The ultimate purpose of the proposed program is to increase the number of well-trained social psychologists in Latin America so that in the future advanced training in the discipline can be provided in Latin American universities. This is viewed as an essential "next step" in the development of social psychology in Latin America. Most social psychologists working there have received their advanced training in the United States or Europe, and local facilities for such training are very limited. Because Latin American social psychologists trained abroad often have not returned to their home countries after they have been trained, there is a dearth of professionals qualified to train others there. Members of the Latin American Committee have been actively trying to develop resources for advanced training in their own countries. According to the plan drafted in December, it will recruit promising students in psychology for advanced training in social psychology under the program. A special course of studies will be designed for each student, to meet his needs and interests and take advantage of available opportunities. Members of the Council's committee have been attempting to identify university departments of psychology in the United States and Europe which will accept these students for part of their training. One or two years of the training program are expected to involve study or dissertation research in the home country. Seven students, two from Chile, two from Brazil, and three from Mexico, have been selected to begin the training program as soon as arrangements are completed. They are expected to be placed in advanced programs at the University of Bristol, Columbia University, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, University of Michigan, and University of Wisconsin. One student will receive specialized training at the University of Mexico. The program will be administered by the Latin American Committee, which is seeking funds for its autonomous existence and continuing efforts to develop social psychology in Latin America.

PERSONNEL

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Social Science Personnel—Murray G. Murphey (chairman), H. M. Blalock, Jr., Milton C. Cummings, John M. Darley, Laura Nader, Jerome Rothenberg, and Karl E. Taeuber—on March 19–20 voted to offer 22 new appointments, 2 predoctoral and 20 postdoctoral:

S. Robert Aiken, Ph.D. candidate in geography, Pennsylvania State University, for postdoctoral training and interdisciplinary research in content analysis, sampling theory, and psychology

Myrdene Anderson, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Yale University, for training in ethnobiology and field study in Europe of Lapp reindeer herding

Jean L. Blumen, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Harvard University, for postdoctoral training in statistical, mathematical, and computer techniques (renewal of fellowship awarded in 1968–69)

Ivan D. Chase, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Harvard University, for postdoctoral training at Dartmouth College in mathematics and its applications in research on social inequality

Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D. candidate in social science, University of California, Irvine, for postdoctoral training in advanced mathematics and logic

Howard Gardner, Ph.D. candidate in social psychology, Harvard University, for postdoctoral study and research in developmental psychology with specific reference to brain damage and symbolic functioning

Jerry F. Hough, Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto, for postdoctoral training at the University of Michigan in statistics and survey research techniques

Noel Kaplowitz, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Columbia University, for postdoctoral training at Yale University in psychology for political scientists

Yasuhide Kawashima, Assistant Professor of History, University of Texas at El Paso, for postdoctoral training at Harvard Law School in American law

Kai Nien Lee, Ph.D. candidate in physics, Princeton University, for postdoctoral study of organization theory and technology assessment

Jacques Légaré, Associate Professor of Demography, University of Montreal, for postdoctoral training at the University of California, Berkeley, in application of mathematical models to demography

Stanley B. Lubman, Acting Associate Professor of Law, University of California, Berkeley, for postdoctoral study of the perspectives of social sciences in research on conflict resolution, social control, bureaucracy, and social change

Philip J. Mause, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Iowa, for postdoctoral training in behavioral sciences involved in public policy programs

James W. McGinnis, Ph.D. candidate in educational psychology, Yeshiva University, for postdoctoral study of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics in preparation for cross-cultural research on language acquisition and development

Sharon G. Nathan, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for training at the University of Michigan in psychology

Robert T. Orrill, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Wisconsin, for postdoctoral training at Yale University in application of psychological and psychiatric concepts in historical research

Benjamin I. Page, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Stanford University, for postdoctoral training at Harvard University or Massachusetts Institute of Technology in economic theory and econometrics

Edward A. Purcell, Jr., Visiting Assistant Professor of History, University of Missouri – Columbia, for postdoctoral training in law and research in American legal history

Naomi Quinn, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Stanford University, for postdoctoral study of models of decision making and related mathematics

V. Somasundara Rao, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Western Ontario, for postdoctoral training in advanced mathematics

Stanley K. Schultz, Assistant Professor of American Urban History, University of Wisconsin, for postdoctoral study at Harvard Law School of the techniques, concepts, and aims of law, with special reference to urban legal problems

Carol A. Smith, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Stanford University, for postdoctoral training in quantitative techniques of economic analysis in preparation for research on marketing in a non-Western economy

FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS

The Committee on Faculty Research Grants—Jerome L. Stein (chairman), Theodore R. Anderson, Allan G. Bogue, Bernard S. Cohn, Edward E. Johnson, Everett C. Ladd, Jr., and Peter N. Stearns—at its meeting on March 22–23 awarded 20 grants:

Thomas M. Achenbach, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Yale University, for research in Switzerland on relations between awareness of conservation and the development of symbolic representation in children

Benedict R. Anderson, Assistant Professor of Government, Cornell University, for research in Indonesia and London on the breakdown of guided democracy in Indonesia

John A. Armstrong, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin, for research on the evolution of administrative elites in Europe

Stuart Blumin, Assistant Professor of History, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for research on community and society in ante bellum America: a case study of social change in a Hudson Valley community

V. K. Chetty, Associate Professor of Economics, Columbia University, for research in Belgium on formulation and estimation of dynamic models under uncertainty

C. Stewart Gillmor, Assistant Professor of History, Wesleyan University, for research on the history of ionospheric physics

Dean H. Harper, Associate Professor of Sociology and Psychiatry, University of Rochester, for research on computer simulation of sociological surveys

J. H. Hexter, Professor of History, Yale University, for contextual analysis of the thinking of European writers on politics on the eve of the Reformation

Thomas Parke Hughes, Professor of History of Technology, Southern Methodist University, for research in Germany on the evolution of electric light and power systems

Robert Jervis, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University, for research on the varieties and causes of misperception of others' intentions in international relations

Herbert S. Klein, Associate Professor of History, Columbia University, for research in Argentina and Bolivia on a demographic history of Colonial Bolivia (Upper Peru)

Peter R. Knights, Assistant Professor of History, University of Illinois, for research on migration as a factor in the urbanization process: Boston, 1850–80

Daniel S. Lev, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Washington, for a comparative study in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Pakistan of legal institutions and sociopolitical change

Eric A. Nordlinger, Associate Professor of Politics, Brandeis University, for research on conflict regulation in divided societies

Akos A. Ostor, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Minnesota, for research in West Bengal on the structural relations among the different fields of Bengali culture

Frank A. Pinner, Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University, for research on a theory of political behavior

Patrick G. Porter, Assistant Professor of Business History, Harvard University, for research on the social and economic structure of the business community of Baltimore, 1840–1900

Karl A. Schleunes, Associate Professor of History, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, for research in Germany on national identity and education in the German Empire of the 1870's

Philippe C. Schmitter, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago, for research in Portugal on the debate on its entry into the European Economic Community and the probable consequences

Sidney G. Tarrow, Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University, for completion of research in France on local politics

GRANTS FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, sponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies—Joseph Grunwald (chairman), Julio Cotler, John T. Dorsey, Jr., Munro S. Edmonson, Richard R. Fagen, Carl F. Hereford, Stanley R. Ross, Joseph Sommers, and Osvaldo Sunkel—at its meeting on March 9–10 awarded 22 grants for research, and 5 collaborative research grants:

Research grants

Winfield J. Burggraaff, Assistant Professor of History, University of Missouri – Columbia, for research in Venezuela on the politics of modernization, 1936–48 (renewal of grant made in 1967–68)

Ronald H. Chilcote, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California, Riverside, for research in Brazil on elites and development in two backlands communities in the Northeast

René de Costa, Assistant Professor of Spanish, University of Chicago, for research in Chile on the vanguard tendency in Chilean poetry (1920–40)

Ralph della Cava, Assistant Professor of History, Queens College, City University of New York, for research in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Italy on the Franco-Italian Church and Latin American Catholicism, 1870–1970

Jaime A. Giordano, Associate Professor of Spanish, State University of New York at Stony Brook, for research in Mexico City and Buenos Aires on intellectual dissent: the current Spanish American essay

Edward Gonzalez, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, for research in Cuba and the United States on Castro's political system, 1965–71

Michael T. Hamerly, Instructor in History, University of Northern Colorado, for research in Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador on the historical demography of each country

James A. Hanson, Assistant Professor of Economics, Brown University, for research in the United States on industrial growth, technical dualism, and the technology gap in selected Latin American countries

Frank W. Hatch, Assistant Professor of Dance, Wisconsin State University – Stevens Point, for historical and ethnological research in Brazil on "Capoeira," an Afro-American dance form of the Northeast

Donald Hindley, Associate Professor of Politics, Brandeis University, for research in Costa Rica on the course of political change since independence

Shane J. Hunt, Associate Professor of Economics and International Affairs, Princeton University, for research in the United States and Peru on the influence of relative prices and income distribution on Peruvian economic growth, 1945–70

Daniel H. Levine, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, for a comparative study in Venezuela and Colombia of the response of the Church to change

Manuel A. Machado, Jr., Associate Professor of History, University of Montana, for research in Mexico on its livestock industry in a revolutionary environment, 1910–70

June Nash, Associate Professor of Anthropology, New York University, for further research in Bolivia on worker consciousness among tin miners and the development of ideologies (supplementary to grant made in 1968–69)

Bernard Nietschmann, Assistant Professor of Geography, University of Michigan, for research in Nicaragua on changing social and energy relationships in the transition from subsistence to a market economy

Laura Randall, Assistant Professor of Economics, Hunter College, City University of New York, for research in Buenos Aires on the economic history of Argentina since 1914

Daniel R. Reedy, Professor of Spanish, University of Kentucky, for research in Lima on the writings of Magda Portal, and their significance as literature of commitment in the twentieth century

Clark W. Reynolds, Associate Professor of Economics, Stanford University, for research in Latin America and the United States on financial intermediation, public policy, and growth in selected Latin American countries (supplementary to collaborative research grant made in 1968–69)

Jaime E. Rodríguez O., Assistant Professor of History, California State College, Long Beach, for research in Ecuador on its agricultural history in the nineteenth century

Ivan A. Schulman, Professor of Spanish, State University of New York at Stony Brook, for research in Cuba on the life and writings of José Martí and contemporary criticism of his work

Leo Spitzer, Assistant Professor of History, Dartmouth College, for research in Brazil on intellectual reactions of Afro-Brazilian freedmen to Western culture, 1822–88

Alfred C. Stepan, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Yale University, for a comparative study in Latin America of civil-military relations: toward an empirical theory of the role of the military as a political institution

Collaborative research grants

David A. Brading, Assistant Professor of History, University of California, Berkeley, and Enrique Florescano, Professor of History, College of Mexico, for research in Mexico City and Morelia on agricultural prices and production in Michoacán, Guanajuato, and San Luis Potosí, 1650–1850

Oscar Cornblit, Research Associate, Social Research Center, Torcuato Di Tella Institute, and Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz, Visiting Associate Professor of History, New York University, for research in Spain, Argentina, Peru, and Bolivia on demographic, economic, and sociopolitical structure and change in Upper Peru during the great rebellions of the late eighteenth century

Eulalia M. L. Lobo, Visiting Professor of History, University of South Carolina, and Harold B. Johnson, Jr., Assistant Professor of History, University of Virginia, for research in Rio de Janeiro on money, prices, and wages in Rio de Janeiro, 1763–1930 (renewal)

Carlos M. Pelaez, Assistant Professor of Economics, Vanderbilt University, and Wilson Suzigan, Chief, Real Product Sector of the Brazilian Social Accounts, Brazilian Institute of Economics, Getúlio Vargas Foundation, for completion of research in Rio de Janeiro on the monetary history of Brazil, 1822–1970

Riordan J. A. Roett, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, and Domingo M. Rivarola, Director, Paraguayan Center of Sociological Studies, for research in Asunción, Montevideo, and Buenos Aires on the origin, composition, and role in politics of the Paraguayan political elite, since 1930

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

The Joint Committee on the Near and Middle East, sponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies—Marvin Zonis (chairman), Robert McC. Adams, Paul Ward English, Joel L. Kraemer, John Masson Smith, Jr., and I. William Zartman—at its meeting on January 15–16 awarded 9 grants for research:

Barbara C. Aswad, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Wayne State University, for research in Turkey on marriage and visiting patterns among the elite families of a small provincial city

Peter J. Chelkowski, Assistant Professor of Persian, New York University, for research in Rome, Paris, and London on *Ta'zieh-Khani,* Iranian Passion play: its development and social, dramatic, and literary values

Ross E. Dunn, Assistant Professor of History, San Diego State College, for research in Europe, Algeria, and Morocco on the revolt and dissidence of Abū Himāra (Bou Hamara) in Northeast Morocco, 1902–09

Carter V. Findley, Captain, U.S. Army (Ph.D. in history and Middle Eastern studies, Harvard University), for research in Istanbul and the United States on the beginnings of bureaucratic reform in the Middle East: development of the Ottoman Foreign Ministry

Andrew C. Hess, Associate Professor of History, Temple University, for research in London, Madrid, and Rabat on the creation of the Muslim-Christian frontier in the western Mediterranean area by the changing momentum of cultural expansion within the Ottoman Empire and Western Christian states, 1566–80

R. Stephen Humphreys, Assistant Professor of History and Arabic, State University of New York at Buffalo, for research in England, France, and Austria on the history and political institutions of Syria and the Jazira in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries

Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot, Associate Professor of History, University of California, Los Angeles, for research in England and Egypt on the nationalist movement in Egypt and the Liberal Constitutionalist Party, 1919–36

Monte Palmer, Associate Professor of Government, Florida State University, for research in Lebanon, Kuwait, and Iran on political participation among university students in Lebanon and the Middle East

Ehsan Yar-Shater, Professor of Iranian Studies, Columbia University, for research in Switzerland and Iran on the current Iranian dialects of the Jewish communities of Persia

GRANTS FOR SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

Under the program sponsored by the Joint Committee on Slavic and East European Studies, its Subcommittee on Grants for Russian and Soviet Studies—Edward J. Brown (chairman), Clayton L. Dawson, Warren W. Eason, Stephen D. Kertesz, and Hans J. Rogger—and Subcommittee on East Central and Southeast European Studies—Irwin T. Sanders (chairman), Adam Bromke, Paul L. Horecky, Huey Louis Kostanick, John Mersereau, Jr., Egon Neuberger, Michael B. Petrovich, and Alexander M. Schenker—at meetings on March 13 and 5–6, respectively, awarded 31 grants for research:

Oswald P. Backus, Professor of History and Slavic and Soviet Area Studies, University of Kansas, for research on landholding rights of the nobility of Muscovy and Lithuania, 1481–1649

William S. Bennett, Jr., Associate Professor of Sociology, Western Michigan University, for research on student culture in Yugoslav universities

Tatjana Cizevska, Associate Professor of Slavic Languages, Wayne State University, for research on the Hypatian Chronicle

James M. Curtis, Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages, University of Missouri – Columbia, for research on basic problems of Russian literary history

Peter Czap, Jr., Associate Professor of History, Amherst College, for research on a Russian peasant community, 1861–1905

Alexander Dallin, Professor of International Relations, Columbia University, for research on Soviet perception of nonruling Communist parties

Joan Delaney, Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of California, Berkeley, for research on the role of *Russkaja Mysl'* in literary-cultural changes in Russia, 1880 to the Revolution

Elinor M. Despalatović, Assistant Professor of History, Connecticut College, for research on the first decades of the Croatian Peasant Party

George R. Feiwel, Professor of Economics, University of Tennessee, for research on economic forms and revisionism in Bulgaria

Joseph N. Frank, Professor of Comparative Literature, Princeton University, for research on the letters of Dostoevsky

Charles Gati, Associate Professor of Political Science, Union College, for research on restraints on East European foreign policies

Vartan Gregorian, Professor of History, University of Texas at Austin, for research on the development of national culture in Soviet Armenia

Charles E. Gribble, Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Indiana University, for research on early Russian morphology

Leopold H. Haimson, Professor of History, Columbia University, for research on the Russian pre-Revolution, 1907–14

Deborah W. Hardy, Assistant Professor of History, University of Wyoming, for research for a political biography of Petr Tkachev

George W. Hoffman, Professor of Geography, University of Texas at Austin, for research on regional development strategy in Hungary and Eastern Austria

Vaclav Holesovsky, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Massachusetts, for research on the postwar economic development of Czechoslovakia

John S. Kolsti, Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages, University of Texas at Austin, for research on Albanian heroic epic songs

David E. Kromm, Assistant Professor of Geography, Kansas State University, for research on perception of and adjustment to Slovenian water pollution hazards

Ilse Lehiste, Professor of Linguistics, Ohio State University, for research on synthesis experiments with Serbo-Croatian tones

Rado L. Lencek, Associate Professor of South Slavic Languages, Columbia University, for analysis of linguistic interference phenomena in Western Slovene dialects

John E. Malmstad, Assistant Professor of Russian, Columbia University, for research on the poetry of Andrej Belyj

Paul Marer, Assistant Professor of Economics, Herbert H. Lehman College, City University of New York, for research on the Soviet and East European foreign trade data bank

James R. Millar, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Illinois, for research on the economic effort of the Soviet Union during World War II

Nicholas Pashin, Senior Lecturer in Slavic Languages and Literatures, Stanford University, for research on the works of Solzhenitsyn

Andrew Rossos, Assistant Professor of History, University

of Toronto, for research on Czech and Slovak politics, 1848–1970

Joseph Rothschild, Professor of Political Science, Columbia University, for a political and socioeconomic analysis of interwar Central Europe

Harold B. Segel, Professor of Slavic Literature, Columbia University, for research on Polish Romantic drama

Michael Shapiro, Associate Professor of Slavic Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles, for research on topics in Russian morphology.

Evan Vlachos, Associate Professor of Sociology, Colorado State University, for research on urbanization in Southeastern Europe, 1950–70

Gerta H. Worth, Professor of Slavic Languages, University of California, Los Angeles, for research on the origin of literary Russian: the Kievan period

NEW PUBLICATIONS

The Behavioral and Social Sciences: Outlook and Needs. Report by the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee under the auspices of the Committee on Science and Public Policy, National Academy of Sciences, and the Committee on Problems and Policy, Social Science Research Council. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., December 1969. 335 pages. $7.95.

Anthropology, edited by Allan H. Smith and John L. Fischer. Report of the Anthropology Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., November 1970. 158 pages. Cloth, $5.95; paper, $1.95.

Economics, edited by Nancy D. Ruggles. Report of the Economics Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., November 1970. 190 pages. Cloth, $5.95; paper, $2.45.

Geography, edited by Edward J. Taaffe. Report of the Geography Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., May 1970. 154 pages. Cloth, $5.95; paper, $2.45.

History as Social Science, edited by David S. Landes and Charles Tilly. Report of the History Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., March 1971. 160 pages. Cloth, $5.95; paper, $1.95.

Mathematical Sciences and Social Sciences, edited by William H. Kruskal. Report of the Mathematical Sciences Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., November 1970. 92 pages. Cloth only, $4.95.

Political Science, edited by Heinz Eulau and James G. March. Report of the Political Science Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., November 1969. 160 pages. Cloth, $5.95; paper, $1.95.

Psychiatry as a Behavioral Science, edited by David A. Hamburg. Report of the Psychiatry Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., July 1970. 127 pages. Cloth, $5.95; paper, $1.95.

Psychology, edited by Kenneth E. Clark and George A. Miller. Report of the Psychology Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., March 1970. 157 pages. Cloth, $5.95; paper, $1.95.

Sociology, edited by Neil J. Smelser and James A. Davis. Report of the Sociology Panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., November 1969. 187 pages. Cloth, $5.95; paper, $1.95.

China's Fertilizer Economy, by Jung-Chao Liu. Sponsored by the former Committee on the Economy of China. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, November 1970. 188 pages. $6.00.

The City in Communist China, edited by John Wilson Lewis. Product of a conference cosponsored by the Subcommittees on Research on Chinese Society and on Chinese Government and Politics, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, December 28, 1968 – January 4, 1969. Stanford: Stanford University Press, April 1971. 462 pages. $12.95.

Computer-Assisted Instruction, Testing, and Guidance, edited by Wayne H. Holtzman. Product of a conference cosponsored by the Committee on Learning and the Educational Process and the College Entrance Examination Board Commission on Tests, October 21–22, 1968. New York: Harper & Row, December 1970. 415 pages. $10.00.

Experiments in Primary Education, by Eleanor E. Maccoby and Miriam Zellner. Expansion of a paper prepared for a conference held by the Subcommittee on Compensatory Education, Committee on Learning and the Educational Process, May 15–17, 1969. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., October 1970. 144 pages. $2.95.

People of the United States in the Twentieth Century, by Irene B. Taeuber and Conrad Taeuber. Sponsored by the former Committee on Population Census Monographs in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1971. c. 1100 pages. c. $6.50.

Pidginization and Creolization of Languages, edited by Dell Hymes. Product of a conference cosponsored by the Committee on Sociolinguistics and the University of the West Indies, April 9–12, 1968. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, June 1971. 524 pages. $23.50.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1971: DORWIN CARTWRIGHT, ELIZABETH COLSON, LEE J. CRONBACH, PHILIP D. CURTIN, RENÉE C. FOX, DANIEL X. FREEDMAN, WILLIAM GORHAM, SAMUEL P. HAYS, MATTHEW HOLDEN, JR., DELL HYMES, LAWRENCE R. KLEIN, GARDNER LINDZEY, LEON LIPSON, GEOFFREY H. MOORE, JAMES N. MORGAN, JOHN W. PRATT, AUSTIN RANNEY, ALBERT REES, HENRY W. RIECKEN, DAVID M. SCHNEIDER, HERBERT A. SIMON, NEIL J. SMELSER, M. BREWSTER SMITH, EDWARD J. TAAFFE, KARL E. TAEUBER, JOHN M. THOMPSON, DAVID B. TRUMAN, ANDREW P. VAYDA, ROBERT E. WARD, CHARLES V. WILLIE

Officers and Staff: HENRY W. RIECKEN, *President;* BRYCE WOOD, *Executive Associate;* ELEANOR C. ISBELL, ROWLAND L. MITCHELL, JR., DONALD S. SHOUP, DAVID JENNESS, *Staff Associates;* JOHN C. CAMPBELL, *Staff Assistant;* STANLEY LEHMANN, MIRIAM ZELLNER, *Consultants;* CATHERINE V. RONNAN, *Financial Secretary*